

## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Zev Carter	Team: Squad #3	CCRB Case #: 201902270	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Tuesday, 03/12/2019 8:30 PM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 67	18 Mo. SOL 9/12/2020	EO SOL 4/29/2021	
Date/Time CV Reported Wed, 03/13/2019 8:41 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Wed, 03/13/2019 8:41 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Witness(es)	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Joseph Sicari	18517	959230	073 PCT
2. POM Vincent Dandraia	27309	957510	073 PCT
3. SGT Michael Nocerino	00491	937192	073 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Jeffrey Goris	17322	954887	073 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Vincent Dandraia	Abuse: Police Officer Vincent D'Andraia stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	
B.SGT Michael Nocerino	Abuse: Sergeant Michael Nocerino interfered with § 87(2)(b)'s use of a recording device.	
C.SGT Michael Nocerino	Abuse: Sergeant Michael Nocerino refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	
D.POM Vincent Dandraia	Abuse: Police Officer Vincent D'Andraia frisked § 87(2)(b)	
E.POM Vincent Dandraia	Abuse: Police Officer Vincent D'Andraia searched § 87(2)(b)	
F.SGT Michael Nocerino	Abuse: Sergeant Michael Nocerino frisked § 87(2)(b)	
G.SGT Michael Nocerino	Abuse: Sergeant Michael Nocerino searched § 87(2)(b)	
H.POM Joseph Sicari	Abuse: Police Officer Joseph Sicari searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) was an occupant.	
I.POM Vincent Dandraia	Abuse: Police Officer Vincent D'Andraia failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	
J.SGT Michael Nocerino	Abuse: Sergeant Michael Nocerino failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	
	§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)	

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)		

## Case Summary

On March 13, 2019, reporting non-witness § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB over the phone on behalf of his son § 87(2)(b) and his friend § 87(2)(b).

On March 12, 2019, § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were riding in § 87(2)(b)'s car when they were pulled over by Police Officer Vincent D'Andraia of the 73<sup>rd</sup> Precinct in front of § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). Sgt. Michael Nocerino and PO Joseph Sicari of the same command were also in the vehicle with PO D'Andraia. Sgt. Nocerino interfered with § 87(2)(b)'s use of a recording device and refused to provide his shield number to him (**Allegation B: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). **Allegation C: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**. PO D'Andraia frisked and searched § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations D and E: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). Sgt. Nocerino frisked and searched § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations F and G: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). PO Sicari searched § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle (**Allegation H: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were allowed to leave the scene after it was determined that § 87(2)(b)'s car was not stolen. No arrests were made and no summonses were issued. PO D'Andraia and Sgt. Nocerino failed to provide § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) with business cards (**Allegations I and J: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). § 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

This case contains body-worn camera footage from PO D'Andraia, Sgt. Nocerino, and PO Sicari (**01, 02, 03 Board Review**).

## Findings and Recommendations

**Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Vincent D'Andraia stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.**

It is undisputed that on March 12, 2019, at approximately 8:30 p.m., § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were riding in § 87(2)(b)'s § 87(2)(b) was driving. It is further undisputed that the two were stopped by a PO D'Andraia, Sgt. Nocerino, and PO Sicari, who were riding in an unmarked police vehicle.

§ 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) stated that § 87(2)(b) had not committed any Vehicle Traffic Law (VTL) infractions while he drove (**04, 05 Board Review**).

PO D'Andraia stated that he was driving a police vehicle when § 87(2)(b)'s car passed by him in the opposite direction (**07 Board Review**). PO D'Andraia noticed that § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle inspection sticker in the lower right-hand corner of § 87(2)(b)'s windshield (from PO D'Andraia's own perspective), was expired because of its color. The color of vehicle inspection stickers changes periodically to denote their validity. PO D'Andraia told the other officers, "That guy has an expired inspection sticker, I'm going to stop him."

Sgt. Nocerino, who was riding in the front passenger's seat of the police vehicle, stated that he also saw the inspection sticker on § 87(2)(b)'s (06 Board Review). The sticker should have been red, but it was yellow.

06:18 to 06:23 in PO D'Andraia's BWC footage captures PO D'Andraia telling § 87(2)(b) that his inspection is expired after the stop has taken place (01 Board Review). § 87(2)(b) replies, "I know."

A police officer may stop a vehicle for a violation of Vehicle and Traffic Law when they possess "specific and articulable facts which, taken together with rational inferences from those facts, reasonably warrant [the] intrusion." People v. Ingle, 36 N.Y.2d 413 (1975) (citing Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1, 88 S. Ct. 1868 (1968)) (08 Board Review). An individual may not operate a motor vehicle on a public road without a valid certificate of inspection. NY CLS Vehicle and Traffic Law § 306(b) (09 Board Review).

§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)

**Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Michael Nocerino interfered with § 87(2)(b)'s use of a recording device.**

**Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Michael Nocerino refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)**

§ 87(2)(b) stated that after Sgt. Nocerino approached his side of the car, he called his father on FaceTime (05 Board Review). Sgt. Nocerino shined his flashlight into the camera on § 87(2)(b)'s phone and told him to end the call. § 87(2)(b) did not allege that Sgt. Nocerino refused to provide his shield number. However, the allegation is being plead because it is captured on BWC footage.

Sgt. Nocerino stated that upon approaching § 87(2)(b)'s side of the vehicle, he used his flashlight to illuminate the interior of § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle (06 Board Review). Initially, he did not recall whether he pointed the flashlight at § 87(2)(b)'s cell phone or whether § 87(2)(b) was using a cell phone at all. Sgt. Nocerino initially denied that § 87(2)(b) requested his shield number.

In Sgt. Nocerino's BWC footage, § 87(2)(b) who is off-screen, begins to speak to his father over the phone at 01:25. Sgt. Nocerino's flashlight beam can be seen partially illuminating the upper window sill of § 87(2)(b)'s car. After § 87(2)(b) tells his father to "look," Sgt. Nocerino's flashlight beam is adjusted higher. § 87(2)(b) tells Sgt. Nocerino, "Don't put that light up, show your face, boy!" From 01:40 to 01:45, § 87(2)(b) can be heard saying, "All right, I want everybody's badge and shield number" (02 Board Review).

After viewing the portion of his BWC footage which captures the incident, Sgt. Nocerino stated that he adjusted his flashlight to a high level because he wanted to keep § 87(2)(b)'s hands illuminated (06 Board Review). He did not know where § 87(2)(b)'s hands were or what

§ 87(2)(b) was doing with them, during the time captured by the footage. Sgt. Nocerino wanted to be sure that § 87(2)(b) did not have weapons in his hands but § 87(2)(b) had done nothing that led Sgt. Nocerino to believe that he had a weapon. Finally, Sgt. Nocerino acknowledged that § 87(2)(b) requested his shield number but did not recall whether he ever provided it. Sgt. Nocerino stated that his BWC footage captures the entirety of his interaction with both § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 states that an officer is to courteously and clearly state their shield number or otherwise provide it to members of the public upon request (**10 Board Review**).

§ 87(2)(g)

**Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Vincent D’Andraia frisked § 87(2)(b)**

**Allegation (E) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Vincent D’Andraia searched § 87(2)(b)**

**Allegation (F) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Michael Nocerino frisked § 87(2)(b)**

**Allegation (G) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Michael Nocerino searched § 87(2)(b)**

§ 87(2)(b) stated that after the officers stopped his vehicle, PO D’Andraia approached his car door and told him to produce his identification and turn his vehicle off (**04 Board Review**).

§ 87(2)(b) complied. PO D’Andraia opened § 87(2)(b)’s door and requested that § 87(2)(b) leave the vehicle, which he did. PO D’Andraia patted down § 87(2)(b)’s torso, waist, crotch and thigh area. He entered the pockets of § 87(2)(b)’s jacket and pants without removing anything from them. § 87(2)(b) did not provide any testimony about § 87(2)(b) being frisked or searched.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that he witnessed PO D’Andraia pat § 87(2)(b)’s arms and legs and search an unspecified area on his person while he stood outside the driver’s side door (**05 Board**

**Review**). Sgt. Nocerino told § 87(2)(b) to end his FaceTime call and step out of the vehicle. Sgt. Nocerino patted § 87(2)(b) waist, waistband, his legs, arms, and his pockets. Sgt. Nocerino subsequently searched § 87(2)(b) PO D’Andraia searched § 87(2)(b)

PO Sicari stated that before § 87(2)(b) s vehicle was stopped and after PO D’Andraia observed the inspection sticker, PO D’Andraia told him to search for § 87(2)(b) s license plate on his cell phone (**11 Board Review**). PO Sicari searched for § 87(2)(b) s license plate at 8:30:43, according to a warrant audit search (**12 Board Review**). PO Sicari stated that upon searching for § 87(2)(b) s license plate on his department-issued cell phone, he learned that § 87(2)(b) s vehicle was stolen. He then told the other officers, “It’s coming back stolen,” and nothing else.

During his CCRB interview, PO Sicari produced two screenshots of the NYPD “Search” application on his cell phone that display the screens which informed him that § 87(2)(b) s vehicle was stolen (**13, 14 Board Review**). The first screen displays at the top of the screen that § 87(2)(b) s license plate has been searched for. Below the section for entering search terms, a number of potential sources for information regarding the license plate are listed. A red diamond and an exclamation point are inserted in the tab used for accessing information from the FBI’s National Crime Information Center (“NCIC”), calling attention to this source.

The second screenshot provided by PO Sicari displays the NCIC record accessed once PO Sicari tapped on the red diamond icon. The record notes that it is “based on a partial VIN search,” and tells those who read it to “verify all data before taking further action” based upon it. Under this message are multiple pieces of identifying information attached to a stolen vehicle. The words “semi-trailer” are among them. Contact information for the Metropolitan Nashville Police Department (the agency which reported the stolen vehicle) is listed at the bottom of the record with a final message to “[immediately] confirm” the record with the agency.

PO Sicari stated that his phone displayed the screen in **13 Board Review** first. PO Sicari understood the red diamond icon to mean that § 87(2)(b) s car was stolen. After this icon was tapped, PO Sicari’s phone displayed the screen in **14 Board Review**. In his CCRB interviews, PO Sicari stated that he did not understand any of the information in the second screen other than the words “stolen vehicle,” and that TN might mean “Tennessee” (**11, 15 Board Review**). Only the red diamond and the words “stolen vehicle” made PO Sicari believe that § 87(2)(b) s car was stolen.

PO D’Andraia did not know who searched for § 87(2)(b) s license plate (**07 Board Review**). He believed that § 87(2)(b) s vehicle was stolen at the moment an officer’s phone displayed the message that it was stolen. Upon stopping the vehicle, PO D’Andraia approached the vehicle’s driver’s side with caution. PO D’Andraia made no observations about the interior of the vehicle other than that § 87(2)(b) seemed nervous. However, nothing on the occupants’ persons raised PO D’Andraia’s suspicion. PO D’Andraia did not witness anything that made him believe that the occupants were concealing a weapon. PO D’Andraia frisked § 87(2)(b) He did this because the situation was a “felony car stop” because a stolen vehicle involves a felony and an increased risk for officer safety.

PO Sicari's BWC footage, from 00:55 to 01:40, provides a view of PO D'Andraia ordering § 87(2)(b) out of the car, patting his torso and legs, unzipping his quilted down jacket, patting his torso, unzipping a hooded sweatshirt, and patting § 87(2)(b)'s torso a third time (**03 Board Review**). It does not show PO D'Andraia entering § 87(2)(b)'s pockets. PO D'Andraia's own BWC footage, from 00:50 to 01:40, captures the same events, albeit from a more limited perspective (**01 Board Review**).

PO D'Andraia initially did not recall whether he unzipped § 87(2)(b)'s vest or his hooded sweatshirt (**07 Board Review**). He denied entering § 87(2)(b)'s pockets. After being shown BWC footage which captures him unzipping § 87(2)(b)'s vest and jacket and reaching inside to frisk § 87(2)(b), PO D'Andraia explained that he had not felt anything under § 87(2)(b)'s clothing that he believed to be a weapon. He could not feel underneath § 87(2)(b)'s clothing. He unzipped § 87(2)(b)'s clothing because it was bulky, and for his own safety. The bulkiness was caused by "wallets and keys" in § 87(2)(b)'s pockets. PO D'Andraia did not recall which pockets were bulky. They appeared to be "all shapes and sizes."

Sgt. Nocerino stated that he learned that the vehicle was listed as stolen when either he or PO Sicari searched for the license plate (**06 Board Review**). Sgt. Nocerino approached § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle on the passenger side. He made no observations about the interior of the vehicle nor did he observe anything which led him to believe that there was evidence of a crime inside of the vehicle other than that it was potentially stolen. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were "very calm," "cooperative and respectful." Sgt. Nocerino did not observe anything on their persons that he considered suspicious. After both occupants were ordered out of the car, they were frisked. However, Sgt. Nocerino did not know who frisked § 87(2)(b). Sgt. Nocerino frisked § 87(2)(b) because § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle had been reported as stolen and because he wanted to be sure that there were no weapons in the car. Sgt. Nocerino denied that he entered § 87(2)(b)'s pockets.

Sgt. Nocerino's own BWC footage, from 02:10 to 02:35, captures Sgt. Nocerino's frisk of § 87(2)(b) (**02 Board Review**). PO D'Andraia's BWC footage, from 02:10 to 02:35, captures Sgt. Nocerino patting § 87(2)(b)'s torso and arms (**01 Board Review**). PO Sicari's BWC footage, from 02:26 to 02:36, captures Sgt. Nocerino patting § 87(2)(b)'s torso and legs (**03 Board Review**). No BWC footage captures Sgt. Nocerino entering § 87(2)(b)'s pockets.

A police officer who receives a report of an observation from a fellow officer has that knowledge imputed to him, and may act on it as if he made the observation himself. People v. Crespo, 207 A.D.2d 668 [1994] (**16 Board Review**). Grand larceny auto is not considered to be a violent offense in and of itself. NYS Penal Law § 70.02 (**27 Board Review**)

During a car stop, a police officer with founded suspicion that criminal activity is afoot may not frisk or search an occupant unless they have "knowledge of some fact or circumstance to support a reasonable suspicion" that an individual is armed or poses a threat. People v. Hill, 262 A.D.2d 870 (App. Div. 1999) 871 (**32 Board Review**).

To conduct a protective pat frisk of the driver of a stopped vehicle, an officer “must have ‘knowledge of some fact or circumstances that supports a reasonable suspicion that the suspect is armed or poses a threat to safety.’” People v. Driscoll, 101 A.D.3d 1466 (App. Div. 2012), citing People v. Batista, 88 N.Y.2d 650 (1996) (**33 Board Review**). Upon completion of a frisk, when an officer knows that a bulge on one’s person is not a weapon, they may not continue to search the individual. People v. McGriff, 99 A.D.2d 818 (App. Div. 1984) (**28 Board Review**) When an officer has no knowledge of some fact or circumstance that supports a reasonable suspicion that the passenger of a stopped vehicle is armed or poses a threat to their safety, a frisk of the passenger will be improper. People v. Ford, 145 A.D.3d 1454 (App. Div. 2016) (**29 Board Review**)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

**Allegation (H) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Joseph Sicari searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.**

It is undisputed that PO D’Andraia searched § 87(2)(b)’s vehicle after the occupants were frisked and § 87(2)(b) was searched.



§ 87(2)(b) stated that he was brought to the back of his vehicle by officers and that from there, he watched as PO D'Andraia searched the interior of his car (**04 Board Review**). PO D'Andraia looked through the compartments on § 87(2)(b)'s car door, looked at the VIN plates near the windshield and in the door sill, retrieved the car's registration from the glove compartment, and searched the rear seats of the vehicle. PO D'Andraia gave the car's registration to another officer.

PO D'Andraia stated that after § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were frisked and § 87(2)(b) was searched, the two were brought to the rear of the car. PO D'Andraia still believed that § 87(2)(b)'s car was stolen, as he was informed by PO Sicari. PO D'Andraia searched § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle but did not recall where (**07 Board Review**). He did not recall whether he searched inside of the glove compartment or retrieve any documentation. PO D'Andraia searched § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle because he was then involved in a "felony car stop." PO D'Andraia explained that he characterized the situation as a felony car stop because the existence of a stolen vehicle implies that a felony has taken place.

PO Sicari stated that after § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were frisked and § 87(2)(b) was searched, the two were brought to the rear bumper of § 87(2)(b)'s car. PO Sicari called the phone number listed on the screen which informed him that § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle was stolen (**11 Board Review**). He reached Metropolitan Nashville Police Department in Tennessee. PO Sicari spoke with an officer there and provided them with § 87(2)(b)'s VIN and license plate number. The officer informed PO Sicari that the vehicle which was listed as stolen in the Nashville Metropolitan Police Department's database was in fact a semi trailer, and that § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle was not stolen. He told this to the other officers on scene and they "warned and admonished" § 87(2)(b) to solve the problem himself.

Sgt. Nocerino stated that he did not search § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle or witness any other officer do so (**06 Board Review**). Sgt. Nocerino's understanding of PO Sicari's phone call was that during this phone call, it was determined that some of the digits on § 87(2)(b)'s license plate matched those of a stolen tractor trailer. Before this phone call, Sgt. Nocerino did not know that the property that was in fact reported to have been stolen was a tractor trailer.

PO D'Andraia's BWC footage captures this portion of the incident (**01 Board Review**). When the timestamp reaches 8:34 p.m. (PO D'Andraia's BWC is set to the wrong time zone, and the footage incorrectly displays the time as 7:34 p.m.), PO D'Andraia retrieves § 87(2)(b)'s registration from his glove compartment. After handing off the registration to another officer, PO D'Andraia continues to search the passenger cabin of § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle.

PO Sicari's BWC footage shows that he called the Metropolitan Nashville Police Department at 8:37 p.m., three minutes after PO D'Andraia first searched § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle (**03 Board Review**).

A police officer who receives a report of an observation from a fellow officer has that knowledge imputed to him, and may act on it as if he made the observation himself. People v. Crespo, 207 A.D.2d 668 [1994] (**16 Board Review**). If a police officer has reasonable belief that a vehicle is associated with a crime and that a search of said vehicle would "produce the fruits,

instrumentalities, contraband or evidence” of a crime, they may conduct the search. People v. Lewis, 26 N.Y.2d 547 (17 Board Review).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

**Allegation (I) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Vincent D’Andraia failed to provide**  
§ 87(2)(b) **with a business card.**

**Allegation (J) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Michael Nocerino failed to provide** § 87(2)(b)  
§ 87(2)(b) **with a business card.**

The following facts are also undisputed: PO D’Andria frisked and searched § 87(2)(b) and searched his vehicle. Sgt. Nocerino frisked § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were eventually released from the location of the incident without receiving summonses or being arrested. PO D’Andraia and Sgt. Nocerino did not provide § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b) with business cards at the conclusion of the incident.

It is also undisputed that § 87(2)(b) an acquaintance of § 87(2)(b) arrived at the location shortly before the end of the incident. § 87(2)(b) recorded a brief portion of the incident on video, which does not capture any FADOs. § 87(2)(b) was unable to provide § 87(2)(b)s email or mailing address. § 87(2)(b) was unavailable to the investigation after contact attempts (see IA #202).

PO D’Andraia stated that at the time of the incident, he knew nothing about the circumstances under which an officer is obligated to offer a business card to a civilian (07 Board Review). PO D’Andraia did not know whether he had been trained on the Right to Know Act at the time of the incident.

Sgt. Nocerino stated that as the officers were returning to their cars, a male who he believed to be either § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b)s father arrived on scene. Sgt. Nocerino provided this

male with a business card. The male told Sgt. Nocerino that he had no reason to stop § 87(2)(b) s car, and Sgt. Nocerino explained the reason for the stop to him. Sgt. Nocerino acknowledged during his interview that officers are required to provide business cards at the conclusion of car stops **(06 Board Review)**.

§ 87(2)(b) stated over the phone that he did not witness the incident **(31 Board Review)**.

New York City Administrative Code § 14-174 states that officers provide individuals who are frisked and searched and whose vehicles are searched with business cards when related law enforcement activities, which do not result in arrest or summons, are concluded **(18 Board Review)**.

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

#### Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b)

- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED] which was substantiated, and an allegation of a search which was substantiated.
- PO D'Andraia has been a member of service for four years and has been a subject in six complaints and 16 allegations, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g) [REDACTED]
- Sgt. Nocerino has been a member of service for 14 years and has been a subject in 13 complaints and 38 allegations, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g) [REDACTED]

### Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] and § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] declined to mediate this complaint.
- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] and § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] filed a Notice of Claim with the City of New York claiming an illegal stop, seizure, and search, assault, battery, and the violation of their civil and constitutional rights and seeking \$500,000 as redress (**23 Board Review**). As of November 26, 2019, a 50-H hearing has not been scheduled.
- According to the Office of Court Administration (OCA), § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] has no history of convictions in New York City (**25 Board Review**).
- According to OCA, § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] has no history of convictions in New York City (**26 Board Review**).

Squad No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
-----------	--------------------	------

Squad Leader: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
-----------	--------------------	------

Reviewer:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Print Title & Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date